

REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, 4-9, 12-21, 23, 25 and 26 are pending, with claim 1 being independent. By this amendment, claims 10 and 11 have been canceled and claims 25 and 26 have been added. No new matter has been introduced.

Claims 10 and 11 have been canceled in response to the rejection under section 112, second paragraph. Cancellation of these claims obviates this rejection.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 8, 13-18, 21, 22 and 24 have been rejected as being anticipated by, or obvious in view of, Kester (U.S. Patent No. 6,008,975). Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections because, as has been previously noted, Kester does not describe or suggest a pre-impregnated composite matrix of fiberglass bundles and epoxy resin that continuously covers a circumferential surface of the one or more MOV disks, as recited in claim 1.

The rejection asserts that the matrix 21 of Kester corresponds to the recited matrix, with the tape 24 corresponding to a fiberglass bundle. However, the matrix 21 does not itself constitute a pre-impregnated composite and, instead, includes separate layers of resin (e.g., layers 22 and 25) and separate tape layers (e.g., tapes 24 and 28). Also, while the tape 24 could be said to correspond to a pre-impregnated composite, it does not continuously cover a circumferential surface of the MOV disk. Rather, as shown in Fig. 4 of Kester, the tape segments 24 only occupy short strips of the circumferential surface of the MOV disk. This point is more explicit with respect to new dependent claim 25, which recites that the pre-impregnated composite extends around the circumferential surface of the at least one MOV disk as a single continuous sheet, as discussed in the application at, for example, page 7, lines 8-16 and lines 28-31.

Applicants also request reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections because, as has been previously noted, Kester does not describe or suggest a pre-impregnated composite that is capable of withstanding an 80 kA fault current for 12 time cycles, as recited in claim 1. In response to this argument, the rejection asserts, in effect, that the "for 12 time cycles" limitation may be ignored by assigning any arbitrary value to the duration of the time cycle. Applicants